

Applicant: Jorma Haag et al.
Application No.: 10/517,718
Response to Office action dated May 24, 2007
Response filed August 22, 2007

Remarks

Claims 14–19 remain pending in the application. Claims 9–13 have been canceled. In the Office action dated May 24, 2007, claims 14–18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Baiker (US 5,024,465), claim 19 was rejected as being indefinite. The drawings were objected to as not illustrating the features of claim 19. Claim 19 was indicated as being allowable if the objection to the drawings, and indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. § 112 are overcome, and it is rewritten in independent form. The abstract of the disclosure was objected to because it failed to include parentheses for the numbers.

A new Fig. 4 has been added schematically illustrating the noted features, and the specification has been amended to provide a new paragraph describing the new figure, and to amend description to refer to the new drawing. The new drawing is based on the written description of the specification particularly –see:

Multinip calenders comprise several rolls successively, for example on top of each other, and in them the number of rolls is larger than in soft-calenders, typically 6 to 12. In multinip calenders the web W travels through nips formed between successive rolls. Some of the rolls are soft-faced polymer rolls.

¶ [0005]

and

The loading of rolls during use is typically adjusted by means of hydraulic relief cylinders, whereby it is advantageous to combine quick opening of rolls with the function of the relief cylinders. ¶ [0007]

and

It is advantageous to implement the adjustment of the volume of the quick-opening cylinder 6 in the manner shown in Figs 2 and 3 by changing the length of the auxiliary piston 7, because the frame 2 of the relief cylinder 1 and the arm 3 are thus similar, irrespective of the volume of the quick-opening cylinder. This is especially advantageous when several different rolls are guided in a multinip calender 20 according to the invention, because it is possible to determine individual quick-opening dimensions for the rolls 22 on the basis of the dimensions of the auxiliary pistons 7, and still similar frame parts 2 and arm parts 3 of the relief cylinder are used in each roll, wherein maintenance can be arranged very economically.”(*Underlined reference symbols added*) ¶ [0030]

Applicant: Jorma Haag et al.
Application No.: 10/517,718
Response to Office action dated May 24, 2007
Response filed August 22, 2007

The Abstract has been amended as required by the examiner to includes parentheses around the reference numbers.

Claim 19 has been amended to make clear that a first relief cylinder and the second relief cylinder are located in a multi-nip calender, overcoming the indefiniteness rejection. Support for claim 19 is now found in FIG. 4 as well as FIGS. 1–3 and in the specification as amended. Claim 19 has been rewritten in independent form based on amended claim 16.

Claim 14, and 16 have been amended to claim a multi-nip calender and a roll of the multi-nip calender. The preamble of the claims is referred to in the first element of the claims, making the preamble a positive limitation of the claim. Baiker discloses an axis suspension for vehicles. There is nothing in Baiker which suggests using the structure disclosed to form a relief cylinder in a multi-nip calender.

Claims 15, 17, and 18 have been amended to conform their preambles to the independent claim from which they depend.

Applicant believes that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

Applicant submits that the claims, as amended, are in condition for allowance. Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt2.res

August 22, 2007 (5:01pm)